

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-17 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Claims 1 and 10 are amended to clarify that the short locator tool performs the inferring step. The amendments do not introduce any elements requiring further search by the Examiner since claim 1 previously stated that the short locator tool performed the inferring step. Specifically, claims 1 previously stated: "running a short locator tool, comprising ... inferring labels to the copy of the artwork." Hence, entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,299,139 to Baisuck et al. (hereafter Baisuck) in view of U.S. Patent 6,230,299 to McSherry et al. (hereafter McSherry). On page 3 the Office Action rejects claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Baisuck in view of McSherry and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,321,369 to Heile et al. (hereafter Heile). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the previous Office Action admits that Baisuck and McSherry "do not teach creating a copy of their artwork (layout) and inferring labels to that copy." However, the Office Action asserts that Heile "disclose an electronic design methodology that makes use of copying, deleting, renaming, adding, as well as other editing choices The analysis tool includes a layout editor ... so that changes (like adding/deleting) labels can be made."

Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 includes the step of "running a short locator tool, comprising ... the short locator tool inferring labels to the copy of the artwork." As described in the specification at page 4, lines 3 – 6, the short locator tool determines, through examination of a text file, what the correct configuration of the circuit should be: "the tool knows that all SET ports are suppose [sic] to be connected to CK1 and all GND ports are suppose [sic] to be connected to GND1." Based on this determination, the locator tool then infers labels for each connection in the circuit. For example, the locator tool infers the label CK1 for all SET labels.

As stated in the September 9, 2003 response, the term "inferring" means "to derive as a conclusion from facts or premises." See Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, © 1974. This definition conforms to Applicant's use of "inferring" in amended claim 1.

Nowhere does Heile disclose or suggest the step of "inferring" labels to the copy of the artwork. The specific references to Heile provided in the Office Action with respect to the rejection of claim 2 (i.e., column 13, line 40, column 8, line 35, and column 7, line 36)

have nothing to do with “inferring” labels. More particularly, Heile at column 13, line 40 discloses a menu having editing features “such as copy, delete, rename, or the like.” None of these choices teach or suggest inferring. Furthermore, the disclosure of a menu implies human intervention to select and execute a function, whereas in the claimed invention, the step is executed and performed by a short locator tool. At column 8, line 35, Heile discloses a layout editor. This reference to Heile does not disclose or suggest inferring. At column 7, line 36, Heile discloses that design file templates may be in any specified format. This reference to Heile also does not disclose or suggest inferring, let alone inferring performed by a short locator tool.

Furthermore, Applicant has diligently reviewed Heile in its entirety, and there is not one hint of a suggestion to “the short locator tool inferring labels to the copy of the artwork” as recited in amended claim 1. As the Office Action admits, Baisuck and McSherry do nothing to correct this deficiency. Because Baisuck, McSherry, and Heile, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest the short locator tool inferring labels to the copy of the artwork, claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 3 – 9 depend from patentable claim 1, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, claims 3 – 9 are also patentable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

On page 4 the Office Action rejects claims 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,275,974 to Bartels et al. (hereafter Bartels) in view of Heile. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Similar to claim 1, claim 10 recites the step of “a short locator tool inferring labels to the copy of the artwork.” As noted above, Heile does not disclose or suggest this feature, and Bartels does nothing to correct this deficiency. Thus Bartels and Heile, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of amended claim 10, and claim 10 is patentable.

Claims 11 – 17 depend from patentable claim 10, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, claims 11 – 17 are also patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 – 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, favorable reconsideration of all pending claims is requested. Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and requests that a notice of allowance be issued.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is required to expedite the prosecution of this application or further clarify the issues, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 10, 2003

Sean S. Wooden
Registration No. 43,997
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2700
Fax (202) 662-2739